

REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated July 8, 2008 ("Office Action"). Claims 1, 3-15, 17-18, 20-22 and 25-28 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-15, 17-18, 20-22 and 25-28 were rejected. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-10, 12-15, 17-18, 20-22 and 25-28 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in at least [0019] and [0025] and Figs. 1-2 of the originally-filed Application. Thus, Claims 1, 3-15, 17-18, 20-22 and 25-28 remain pending in the Application. Claims Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3-8, 11-15, 17-18, 22, 25, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,202,211 to Williams, Jr. (hereinafter "*Williams, Jr.*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0048757 to Accarie, et al. (hereinafter "*Accarie*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0049797 to Salmonsén (hereinafter "*Salmonsén*") and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0056118 to Hunter, et al. (hereinafter "*Hunter*"). Claims 9, 10, 20, 21 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Williams, Jr.* in view of *Accarie* in view of *Salmonsén* and in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0019908 to Williams, et al. (hereinafter "*Williams*"). In light of the amendment to claims as noted below, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 1, 3-8, 11-15, 17-18, 22, 25, 27 and 28

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 13, 22 and 27 are independent. As an example, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "the sink component adapted to display on the first presentation device a menu presenting the A/V program data available from each of the plurality of source components" and "adapted to control presentation of desired A/V program data selected from the menu ... on the second presentation device" (emphasis added). Applicant submits that *Williams, Jr.*, *Accarie*, *Salmonsén*, and *Hunter*, either alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or even suggest this limitation. Indeed, Applicant is unable to locate, and the Examiner has not pointed out, any disclosure of the above-quoted limitation from Claim 1 in the cited references. For at least this reason, Applicant requests that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn and the claim allowed to issue.

As amended, Claim 13 recites, *inter alia*, “displaying a menu presenting A/V program data available from each of a plurality of source components on a first presentation device” and “controlling, via a sink component, presentation of desired A/V program data selected from the menu ... on a second presentation device” (emphasis added). In addition, as amended Claim 22 recites, *inter alia*, “means for displaying a menu presenting A/V program data available from each of a plurality of source components on a first presentation device” and “means for controlling, via a sink component, presentation of desired A/V program data selected from the menu ... a second presentation device” (emphasis added). Also, as amended Claim 27 recites, *inter alia*, “receiving, via a sink component, desired A/V program data selected from a menu presenting A/V program data available from each of a plurality of source components, the menu displayed on a first presentation device” and “presenting the desired A/V program data on a second presentation device” (emphasis added). For the reasons noted above for Claim 1, Applicant submits that *Williams, Jr., Accarie, Salmonsens, and Hunter*, either alone or in combination, do not appear to teach or even suggest this limitation. For at least this reason, Applicant requests that the rejection of Claims 13, 22 and 27 be withdrawn and the claims allowed to issue.

Each of Claims 3-8, 11-12, 14-15, 17-18, 25 and 28, either directly or through intervening claims, depends from and includes all the base limitations of independent Claims 1, 13, 22 and 27, respectively. As such, each of Claims 3-8, 11-12, 14-15, 17-18, 25 and 28 is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons noted above for Claims 1, 13, 22 and 27. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 3-8, 11-12, 14-15, 17-18, 25 and 28 should be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 10, 20, 21 and 26

Each of Claims 9, 10, 20, 21 and 26, either directly or through intervening claims, depends from and includes all the base limitations of independent Claims 1, 13 and 22, respectively. As such, each of Claims 9, 10, 20, 21 and 26 is believed to be patentable over the combination of *Williams, Jr., Accarie, Salmonsens, and Hunter*. In addition, Applicant submits that *Williams* does not appear to overcome the deficiencies of the combination of *Williams, Jr., Accarie, Salmonsens, and Hunter*. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 9, 10, 20, 21 and 26 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

An RCE filing fee of \$810.00 is believed due. The Director of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge the amount of \$810.00 to satisfy the RCE filing fee to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company. If, however, Applicant has miscalculated the fee due with this RCE, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this RCE to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

/James L. Baudino/
James L. Baudino
Registration No. 43,486

Date: **October 8, 2008**

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Department – MS – 4059
19483 Pruneridge Ave.
Cupertino, CA 95014-0604
408-447-0289